

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,227	12/12/2003	Lawson C. Mitchell	PC-1563CIP	1858
23717 7	590 07/28/2004		EXAM	INER
	ES OF BRIAN S STE	GORDON,	GORDON, RAEANN	
	101 BREVARD AVENUE COCOA, FL 32922		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3711	

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		W
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/735,227	MITCHELL ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Raeann Gorden	3711
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply y within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH.	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. & 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 D This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters	•
Disposition of Claims		
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-20 is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplished any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by drawing(s) be held in abeyance ion is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Appl ity documents have been red i (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No ceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/M	mary (PTO-413) ail Date nal Patent Application (PTO-152)

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-16, drawn to a golf device, classified in class 473, subclass 226.
- Claims 17-20, drawn to a method of using a golf device, classified in class
 473, subclass 409.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the golf training device may used by various methods.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Brian Steinberger on July 20, 2004 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of the golf device, claims 1-16. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 17-20 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Art Unit: 3711

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. All claims, explain the term "planar". Claim 1, "twisted at a second angle" is not clear. Claim 2, which "plate" is being claimed (plate in the device or socket)? Claims 4, 5, 14, and 15, "concave" is at odds with specification page 12, which recites "convex". Please note this term is for the single plate and not the double plate embodiment. If the double plate is different from the single plate it should be noted in the specification, i.e., convex. Claim 11, the plates should be distinguished, i.e., first plate and second plate. The plate "bent and twisted at two different angles" is not clear or shown in the drawings. Specifically, the "twisted" portion and the "two different angles" are not understood. Claims 6 and 16, the attachment socket permanently affixed to the club is not understood. Is applicant attempting to claim the device is fabricated integral with the golf club? If so, the figures or

Art Unit: 3711

specification does not show a "socket" when the device is made integral with the club, only the plates are visible (see figure 13A). However, if applicant is stating the socket is permanently fixed to the club, the limitation should be added to the specification. Claim 13, which "plate" is being claimed (plate in the device or socket)? The first occurrence of the "attachment socket" should be deleted. The attachment means cannot comprise a attachment socket (see claims 11 and 12 for clarification). Claim 15, which "plate" is being claimed?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 11, 12, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marshall (5,976,024). Regarding claim 1, Marshall discloses an apparatus for golf comprising an attachment socket (25) and a single plate extending from the top of the socket. The plate is wider at the distal end and is capable of resting on a golfer's arm. The distal end is bent with respect to the end closest to the socket (proximal). Regarding claim 4, the plate has a curved shaped at the distal end. Regarding claim 6, the device is inherently capable of being permanent if it is not removed. Regarding claim 11, Marshall discloses an apparatus for golf comprising an attachment socket (25) and two plates extending from the top of the socket. The plates

Art Unit: 3711

are wider at the distal end and are capable of resting on a golfer's arm. The distal end is bent with respect to the end closest to the socket (proximal). Regarding claim 12, the device is removable from the golf club. Regarding claims 14 and 15, the plates have a curved shaped at the distal end. Regarding claim 16, the device is inherently capable of being permanent if it is not removed.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 8-12, and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vasquez (5,470,073). Regarding claim 1, Vasquez a golfing device comprising an attachment for attaching the device a golf club. The device further includes a single plate extending from the top of the attachment means comprising a first and second end (distal). The second or distal end is wider than the first end and is capable of resting on a golfer's arm. The distal end is also bent with respect to the first end. Regarding claim 4, the distal end has a curved shape. Regarding claims 8-10. Vasquez discloses the plates may be adjusted to any angle, therefore the device is capable of being positioned at the angles claimed by applicant. Regarding claim 11, Vasquez a golfing device comprising an attachment for attaching the device a golf club. The device further includes two plates extending from the top of the attachment means comprising first and second ends (distal). The second or distal end is wider than the first end and is capable of resting on a golfer's arm. The distal end is also bent with respect to the first end. Regarding claim 12, the device is capable of being removed from a golf club. Regarding claims 14 and 15, the plates are curved at the distal ends.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall in view of Lin (6,398,663). Marshal discloses the invention as shown above but fails to teach a threaded collar as the attachment means. However, Lin teaches a golfing device comprising a threaded collar. One of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the attachment means for better security. With respect to claim 3, the device of Marshall is obviously either plastic or metal.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raeann Gorden whose telephone number is 703-308-8354. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Greg Vidovich can be reached on 703-308-1513. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/735,227

Art Unit: 3711

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Raeann Gorden

Primary Examiner Art Unit 3711

rg July 23, 2004